## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |                     |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Plaintiff,                | Case No. 02-81141-0 |
|                           | Case No. 02-61141-0 |
| -VS-                      | HON. AVERN COHN     |
| GAYLON LUNN,              |                     |
| Defendant.                | ,                   |
|                           | _/                  |

## ORDER DENYING MOTION TO EXPUNGE CRIMINAL RECORD

I.

This is a criminal case. In 2003, defendant was convicted, following a guilty plea, of conspiracy to distribute and to possess with intent to distribute cocaine, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 846 and § 841(a)(1). He was sentenced to three years probation.

Defendant has served his period of probation.

Before the Court is defendant's motion to expunge his record.<sup>1</sup> For the reasons that follow, the motion will be denied.

II.

Defendant says he has been a law-abiding citizen since and active in his church and community. He seeks to expunge his conviction because it limits the opportunities

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Although the Court requested that the government file a response to the motion, see Doc. 25, the Court determines no response is necessary. Moreover, the Court deems this matter appropriate for decision without oral argument. <u>See</u> Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b); E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(f)(2).

to provide for himself and his family. Although the Court applauds defendant's productive life and understands the difficulties associated with a criminal record, the Court lacks authority to expunge his conviction. First, while several statutes permit expungement motions, none of the them apply to defendant's case. See 18 U.S.C. § 3607(c) (allowing expungement for a conviction of simple drug possession under 21 U.S.C. § 844; 5 U.S.C. § 552a(g) (expungement to correct inaccurate government records); 42 U.S.C. § 14132(d); 10 U.S.C. § 1565(e) (expungement of DNA records). Moreover, the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit has recently held that in the absence of an applicable statute, a district court lacks jurisdiction to entertain an expungement motion. United States v. Lucido, 612 F.3d 871 (6th Cir. 2010). See also United States v. Childs, No. 93-80302, 2011 WL 768068 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 28, 2011) (denying motion to expunge embezzlement of bank funds conviction); United States v. Brooks, No. 71-46067, 2011 WL 66467 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 10, 2011) (denying motion to expunge armed bank robbery conviction).

Accordingly, defendant's motion is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 14, 2011 S/Avern Cohn

AVERN COHN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to Gaylon Lunn, P.O. Box 10471, Detroit, MI 48210 and the attorneys of record on this date, April 14, 2011, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Julie Owens
Case Manager, (313) 234-5160

2